



**Roger L Belfay**  
Attorney at Law

Friday, December 21, 2007

Attn: Examiner name, Patent Examiner Art Unit 2615

Mail Stop: Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313 1450

Re: Office action of July 3, 2007 concerning:

- US Utility Patent application 10/757,833
- by Van Tassel, Timothy Dale
- filed on January 14, 2004
- for the "Electronic circuit with spring reverberation effect and improved output controllability"
- confirmation number 5505.

Paul Disler:

I enclose:

1. an amended claim section with marked up changes, and
2. a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate a provisional double patenting rejection over a pending "reference" application.

Please enter the above amendments to the subject application.

**The Provisional rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, and 12, 15-17, 21 is obviated by the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer.**

**DC Isolation Filter:** The enclosed amendments add a limitation or additional (and therefore limiting) element to the independent claims namely a "DC-Isolation filter". The art of record does not disclose a "DC-Isolation filter". Such a DC-Isolation filter is disclosed in the present application as:

"The output pathway of IC3b is coupled to the non-inverting input of IC3a via a pair polarized capacitors C5, C6, which appropriately serve to block the passing of any dc signal into IC3a while permitting the passage of the audio signal for eventual input into RP"

in the detailed description and is therefore supported in the present application. Inclusion of this element or additional limitation in the three independent claims (22, 33 and 38) of this application includes this limitation or additional element to all claims in this application and therefore renders all claims patentable over the art of record.

829 Tuscarora Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Telephone: 651-222-2782  
e-mail: rogerbelfay@rogerbelfay.com

**Roger L Belfay**

Attorney at Law

**Spring Reverberation device:** The above amendments add another limitation or additional (and therefore limiting) element to all dependant claims. Each independent claim is followed by a new dependant claim (23, 34, and 39) containing the “spring reverberation device employing three springs with each of said springs having a first spring end and a second spring end and each of the three first spring ends connected to a single first spring end connecting bar, and each of the three second spring ends connected a second spring end connecting bar.” The art of record does not disclose a “spring reverberation device employing three springs with each of said springs having a first spring end and a second spring end and each of the three first spring ends connected to a single first spring end connecting bar, and each of the three second spring ends connected a second spring end connecting bar.” Such a spring reverberation device employing three springs with each of said springs having a first spring end and a second spring end and each of the three first spring ends connected to a single first spring end connecting bar, and each of the three second spring ends connected a second spring end connecting bar, is disclosed in the present application as:

**“RP comprises a spring reverberation device of the type having a 3-spring configuration”**

in the detailed description (see also figure 1 “RP”) and is therefore supported in the present application. Inclusion of this element or additional limitation in dependent claims 23, 34, and 39 of this application includes this limitation or additional element in all dependant claims in this application because all other dependant claims depend from one of claims 23, 34, or 39. Therefore, all dependant claims are patentable over the art of record when considered in conjunction with their respective independent claims.

**The rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholz et al. (4,489,439) in view of Pritchard, (5,802,182) and Telefus (6,370,039 B1) is obviated by entering the enclosed amendments to the claims.**

**The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholz et al. (4,489,439) in view of Pritchard, (5,802,182) and Telefus (6,370,039 B1) and further in view of Bacon (US2004/0190727) is obviated by entering the enclosed amendments to the claims.**

**Roger L Belfay**

Attorney at Law

**The rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholz et al. (4,489,439) in view of Pritchard, (5,802,182) and Telefus (6,370,039 B1) and further in view of Applicant's (Kit Assembly Instructions) is obviated by entering the enclosed amendments to the claims.**

**The rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholz et al. (4,489,439) in view of Pritchard, (5,802,182) and Telefus (6,370,039 B1) and further in view of Ellis (4,158,813) is obviated by entering the enclosed amendments to the claims.**

Sincerely,



Roger L. Belfay  
Registered Patent Attorney  
Registration No. 51449  
Enclosures:

1. Amended claim set
2. Terminal Disclaimer